



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

paratively unknown "world peace treaty" of the kings of England, France, and Spain, October 2, 1518, and also an account of international arbitration during the middle ages. The fifth chapter treats the transition of modern times to a beginning of pacifistic traditions in the churches and sects, such as the Moravian Brothers and the Quakers. The author shows the influences of this movement upon individuals, such as Erasmus, Thomas More, Sebastian Franck. Later chapters deal with the beginning of international law under Suarez, Gentili, Grotius. There is an account of pacifist literature in France and Germany and of plans for international organization such as those of Campanella, Crucé, Sully. The last chapter deals with the Peace of Westphalia.

We are glad to give this review of a review, for we are acquainted with various aspects of Dr. Lange's ability. Our readers will be interested to know something of the nature of his labors in this field. We shall all look forward with interest to the completed work.

THE INEVITABLE REPUDIATION

THE MEANING of November 2 is very plain. Thirty-eight out of the forty-eight States of the American Union voted overwhelmingly that day that Warren G. Harding, Republican candidate for President, should be the Chief Executive of the United States, beginning March 4, 1921. Since the campaign conducted by the various candidates, particularly by the Republican and Democratic leaders, involved primarily two issues, namely, Mr. Wilson's administration and Mr. Wilson's Covenant of the League of Nations, this sweeping vote for Mr. Harding must mean two things: First, that the American people are tired of the Wilson Administration; second—since Mr. Cox said, "I am for going in," and Mr. Harding said, "I am for staying out"—that they do not want his League of Nations.

The ADVOCATE OF PEACE is not especially concerned with Mr. Wilson's administration; but with his proposed Covenant of the League of Nations we are vitally concerned. It has been our attempt to examine and to explain this Covenant. We have found it to be wrong in principle, contrary to the teachings of history, and a menace to the peace of the world. We believe, and we have expressed our belief, that those portions of the so-called league deemed most vital by Mr. Wilson should for such reasons be repudiated. The vote of November 2 is a greater repudiation than we had dared to hope for.

And yet just such a repudiation was inevitable. May 1, 1919, the editor of this magazine, returning from five months of most distressing contacts with the antagonistic personalities around the peace conferees in Paris,

wrote aboard the ship, and subsequently published in the ADVOCATE OF PEACE for May, 1919, an article entitled "The Blur that is Paris." In that article he said:

"Mr. Wilson chafes under the restraint of precedents, in consequence of which he aims to belittle their importance. He criticizes the lawyers. He ignores the achievements of justice. He appeals over the heads of Grotius, Vattel, and the long line of the constructive great and able, to the passions of the untrained. While attempting to eject the trained diplomats out of one door he has let the untrained politicians in at the other. With the phrases 'common council,' 'open covenants openly arrived at,' 'democracy and humanity' upon his lips, he is standing for a superstate with powers of execution for the will of the few, indeed for the exercise of his own will. He is aiming to set up an alliance of the dominating few with no regard for the essential organs of law or justice. The decisions in Paris are not the decisions of the Conference; they are the decisions of the 'Big Three.' . . . When one remembers that the Covenant for the League of Nations provides for the abrogation of the long line of arbitration treaties set up especially through the last hundred years, for the abrogation of the Wilson-Bryan treaties, for the disestablishment of existing international law, and when one recalls the importance of such law, especially in democracies, the smudge that is Paris does not lighten, it deepens."

We heard Mr. Wilson confess in Paris that his league is a League to Enforce Peace. For us that was enough. We saw its doom so far as the United States is concerned, for we knew that the American people would never support a scheme so contrary to the history of American policy.

We condemned the principle of a League to Enforce Peace as far back as August, 1915. We stated editorially then what seemed to us to be ten irrefutable objections to any international police force. The demand for that number of the ADVOCATE OF PEACE exhausted the edition.

Again and again we have tried to show, throughout the war and since, that any league to enforce peace is and by its very nature must be a league for war. In March, 1920, our leading editorial dealt at length with this theme under the caption "An Alliance to Enforce Peace, a War Alliance." In that editorial we gave fourteen reasons why any alliance to enforce peace is impracticable as an agency for international peace. Our columns are open; but no one has submitted a refutation of those fourteen reasons.

But that is not all. The history of the American Peace Society is one long opposition to any league to enforce peace. For nearly a century it has repudiated the idea. But neither is this all. The history of this more perfect union of forty-eight free, sovereign, independent States, since those summer months of 1787, when the whole idea of a league to enforce peace between

the States of the American Union was cast into outer darkness forever, has itself been one long, living protest against any such conception of the settlement of disputes between States. The results of November 2, therefore, need cause no surprise to any one familiar with American history. The repudiation was inevitable.

THE PERMANENT COURT FOR INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

FORTUNATELY with unusual promptitude authoritative expositions of the methods and the achievements of the Advisory Committee of Jurists who framed the plan for a Permanent Court of International Justice, now before the Council and Assembly of the League of Nations, are appearing. Just as we go to press, which precludes any adequate notice in this issue of the *ADVOCATE*, comes a report and commentary by James Brown Scott, published by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Dr. Scott sat with this committee of jurists, acting as adviser to Mr. Elihu Root, and on occasion he participated in the proceedings. In his introduction to the detailed and documented history of the jurists' conference he has given a precise chronicle of the steps that led up to it, described its personnel, recorded the formal speeches at its opening, and also outlined the method by which its rules of procedure were defined. Then come concise, graphic narratives as to how, from day to day, the various plans submitted were debated, and how ultimately the Root-Phillimore plan became the core of the final agreement now before the League's delegates. Jurist and layman alike will find in this inclusive work a model of reporting, fully documented. It is enriched with a commentary replete in knowledge and illuminated by the experience of a man who was technical delegate of the United States to the Second Hague Conference of 1907 and to the Conference of Paris, 1919.

From *The Hague*, edited by M. Albert de Lapradelle, has come the text, in French and in English, of the report to the Council of the League with which the jurists concluded their advisory labors. In it will be found, for the benefit of the Council and such other persons as may be privileged to read it, the history of the process by which these jurisconsults examined Article 14 of the Covenant of the League, and built upon its request to devise a Permanent Court of International Justice their own scheme for giving the article effective form. These jurisconsults trace the origin of the plan and its relation to the conferences at The Hague. They credit the five powers (Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Switzerland) with having contributed valuable suggestions in the plan for such a court.

Following this historical introduction, the report describes point by point the problems that arise as to organization of such a court, the method of electing judges, the court's competence, and its procedure. Supplementing the discussion, the jurists lay before the Council the resolutions they passed, first recommending early summoning of a new interstate conference to carry on the work of the first two conferences of The Hague, and, second, recommending that leading international law associations be invited to aid in preparing draft plans for the business of this conference, which is to be called the Conference for the Advancement of International Law.

UNIVERSITIES AS PEACE-MAKERS

SIR ROBERT FALCONER, president of the University of Toronto, at the educational conferences held in connection with the inauguration of Michigan University's new president, discussed the important theme of "The University and International Relationships." His main thesis is that "there has been in existence for hundreds of years a league which is inevitably international in principle and operation." Moreover, "no political argument gave this league its being and no political veto can abolish it, for scholarship is international, and while it survives it must continue to be international." The league he reveres and trusts is "the league of universities," including, of course, in this all higher institutions of learning, whatever they may be called.

When the universities of a country become distinctly nationalistic, as they were in Germany prior to the war, in his opinion, they err. They have their duties in protection of a national culture, but no less obligatory is the internationalism of scholarship, whether scientific or cultural.

Conceding the thesis as valid, what, then, must universities do? At least three paths open up in which to walk, says this Canadian:

"They may continue the mutually profitable interchange of students between one country and another; they may call outstanding teachers of one country to hold chairs in another, and they may train their students to become genuinely human, to possess those intellectual, moral, and social virtues which distinguish man as man."

May we venture to suggest another? They should prepare, as never before, to inform students and professors alike as to the history of man's efforts to substitute the reign of law for the reign of force. They should make quite impossible, to illustrate, such a divided state of opinion within the academic world as has been disclosed in the United States during the discussion of the